

1  
2  
3  
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 \* \* \*

7 COURTNEY S. MOTLEY,  
8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 CARLOS SILVA, *et al.*,  
11 Defendants.  
12

Case No. 2:23-cv-00624-RFB-BNW

**ORDER**

13  
14 Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 53) of the  
15 Honorable Brenda Weksler, United States Magistrate Judge, entered on December 17, 2024. A  
16 district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations  
17 made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific written objections to the  
18 findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a).  
19 When written objections have been filed, the district court is required to “make a de novo  
20 determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations  
21 to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also Local Rule IB 3-2(b). Where a party  
22 fails to object, however, a district court is not required to conduct “any review,” de novo or  
23 otherwise, of the report and recommendations of a magistrate judge. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140,  
24 149 (1985). Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2(a), objections were due by December 31, 2024. No  
25 objections have been filed. The Court has reviewed the record in this case and concurs with the  
26 Magistrate Judge’s recommendation.

27 ///

28 ///

